

1
2
3
4 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
5 DISTRICT OF NEVADA

6 * * *

7 ABET JUSTICE LLC, et al.,

8 Plaintiff(s),

9 v.

10 FIRST AMERICA TRUSTEE SERVICING
11 SOLUTIONS, LLC, et al.,

12 Defendant(s).

Case No. 2:14-CV-908 JCM (GWF)

ORDER

13
14 Presently before the court is Magistrate Judge Foley's report and recommendation
15 recommending that plaintiff Abet Justice, L.L.C.'s ("Abet Justice") claims be dismissed with
16 prejudice based on plaintiff's failure to comply with the court's order to obtain successor counsel
17 ("R&R"). (ECF No. 121). *Pro se* plaintiff Guetatchew Fikrou filed an objection. (ECF No. 123).

18 In plaintiff Fikrou's objection, he asserts that he is seeking an attorney to represent him on
19 this case and requests additional time to do so. (ECF No. 123). However, the magistrate's R&R
20 recommends dismissal of plaintiff Abet Justice's claims, not of plaintiff Fikrou's claims. (ECF
21 No. 121).

22 Plaintiff Abet Justice has not filed an objection. The deadline to file an objection has since
23 passed.

24 This court "may accept, reject, or modify, in whole or in part, the findings or
25 recommendations made by the magistrate." 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1). Where a party timely objects
26 to a magistrate judge's report and recommendation, then the court is required to "make a de novo
27 determination of those portions of the [report and recommendation] to which objection is made."
28 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1).

1 Where a party fails to object, however, the court is not required to conduct “any review at
2 all . . . of any issue that is not the subject of an objection.” *Thomas v. Arn*, 474 U.S. 140, 149
3 (1985). Indeed, the Ninth Circuit has recognized that a district court is not required to review a
4 magistrate judge’s report and recommendation where no objections have been filed. *See United*
5 *States v. Reyna-Tapia*, 328 F.3d 1114 (9th Cir. 2003) (disregarding the standard of review
6 employed by the district court when reviewing a report and recommendation to which no
7 objections were made).

8 Nevertheless, this court finds it appropriate to engage in a *de novo* review to determine
9 whether to adopt the R&R. Upon reviewing the recommendation and underlying briefs, the court
10 finds that good cause appears to adopt the R&R.

11 On September 8, 2016, plaintiff Fikrou filed a substitution of representation requesting to
12 represent his grantor, plaintiff Abet Justice. (ECF No. 130).

13 While plaintiff Fikrou is entitled to appear *pro se* on his own behalf, he has no authority to
14 appear as an attorney on plaintiff Abet Justice’s behalf or on behalf of anyone else. A corporation
15 is not permitted to appear in federal court unless it is represented by counsel. *United States v. High*
16 *Country Broad. Co., Inc.*, 3 F.3d 1244, 1245 (9th Cir. 1993). Although a non-attorney may appear
17 on his own behalf to represent himself, that privilege is personal to him. *C.E. Pope Equity Trust*
18 *v. United States*, 818 F.2d 696, 697 (9th Cir. 1987). An individual has no authority to appear as
19 an attorney for anyone other than himself. *Id.*

20 Plaintiff Abet Justice failed to respond to the magistrate’s order to show cause, wherein it
21 was cautioned that failure to timely respond would result in the imposition of sanctions. (ECF No.
22 121 at 3). To date, plaintiff Abet Justice still has not obtained successor counsel as ordered by
23 Magistrate Judge Foley.

24 In light of the foregoing, the court will adopt the R&R in its entirety and dismiss plaintiff
25 Abet Justice’s claims with prejudice. As the R&R pertained solely to plaintiff Abet Justice’s
26 claims, this order likewise pertains solely to plaintiff Abet Justice’s claims and not those of plaintiff
27 Fikrou.

28 . . .


1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

Accordingly,

IT IS HEREBY ORDERED, ADJUDGED, AND DECREED that Magistrate Judge Foley’s report and recommendation (ECF No. 121) be, and the same hereby is, ADOPTED in its entirety.

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that plaintiff Abet Justice, L.L.C.’s claims be, and the same hereby are, DISMISSED WITH PREJUDICE consistent with the foregoing.

DATED September 26, 2016.


UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE